REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-42 is hereby respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 to Meyer et al. ("Meyer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,608 to Dillingham ("Dillingham"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,748 to Deen et al. ("Deen"). Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that these references are defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the rejected claims.

As the PTO provides in MPEP §2143, "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." Furthermore, under MPEP §2142, "[i]f the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness." It is submitted that the Office action does not factually support a prima facie case of obviousness for the following, mutually exclusive, reasons.

First, even when combined, the cited references do not teach the claimed subject matter. Independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40, as amended, disclose using an Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring operations, and wherein the remote web content authoring operations are allowed by the protocol without executing an interface or agent program. In contrast, Meyer requires the installation and use of an "agent" on each client computer, wherein the client computer is accessed when a "web browser makes a request to the agent" (col. 3, line 35-50). Then, "the agent preferably executes a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) program which pulls selected data from the operating system of the computer" (col. 3, line 54-57). Thus, the primary reference, Meyer, specifically requires an executable agent program to perform operations, whereas the invention as claimed precludes the execution of such a program.

The Dillingham and Deen references fail to remedy the deficiencies of Meyer, as their cited text fails to teach or suggest operations for which Meyer relies on an agent.

Accordingly, the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40 as required by MPEP § 2143, and the claims are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 2-11, 13-22, 24-33, 35-39, and 41-42 depend from and further limit claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 40, and are allowable as well.

Another mutually exclusive reason that the Office action does not factually support a prima facie case of obviousness is that the combination of references is improper. As the PTO provides in MPEP §2143, "there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings." Here, the cited references teach disparate methods of accessing system files. More specifically, Meyer discloses a system in which access is "controlled through the use of agents on the computers" (Abstract). In contrast, Deen discloses "system access source control within standard request-response protocols" (col. 2, line 55-57), while Dillingham discloses "[a] server-side script [that] receives the client request and invokes a file system object to enumerate the files and/or folders for the directory path specified in the client request. The server-side script then creates a client-side script, which when executed at the client will instantiate a custom client-side object to cache the directory data and to present that data in a dialog UI." (Abstract). Applicant submits that one skilled in the art when the claimed invention was unknown would have had no basis for combining the installed agent access methodology of Meyer with the protocol controlled request-response access methodology of Deen and the script driven approach of Dillingham.

Furthermore, even if Meyer, Deen, and Dillingham can be combined (which they clearly cannot be, as described above), the combination would change the principle of operation of at least one of the references in contravention of MPEP § 2143.01 due the previously described disparate methods of accessing system files. Thus, the cited references are not properly combinable and, even if they could be combined, such a combination would result only from hindsight based on the claimed invention without any showing, suggestion, or motivation for the combination as applied to claims 1-42.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy F. Bliss
Registration No. 50,925

Date: June 3, 2003
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972/739-8638
Facsimile: 972/692-9101
File No. 26530.3
R-48596_1.DOC

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on June 3, 2003.

Gayle Conner